UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/377,629	08/19/1999	BRYCE ALLEN CURTIS	AT9-99-179	8139

24033 7590 07/17/2003

KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN, LLP
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE
SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER	
KISS, ERIC B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/377,629	Applicant(s) CURTIS ET AL.
	Examiner Eric B. Kiss	Art Unit 2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 August 1999* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 February 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *2* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 have been examined.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 1, in line 23, "280,371" should read --09/280,371--. Appropriate correction is required.

3. The use of various trademarks, such as WINDOWS, JAVA, SOLARIS, LINUX, OS/2 WARP, OS/390, AIX, AS/400, has been noted in this application. Trademarks should be capitalized (each letter should be capitalized) wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

The Examiner notes and appreciates Applicant's acknowledgement of the WINDOWS, MICROSOFT, AIX, and JAVA trademarks on page 17 of the specification. However, other trademarks, such as those listed above, appear in the specification and all occurrences of trademarks should be acknowledged appropriately and consistently in accordance with MPEP §608.01(v).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-4, 6, 10-13, 15, 19-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ron Petrusha, "Inside the Windows 95 Registry," 1996, O'Reilly & Associates, Inc. (hereinafter *Petrusha*).

As per claims 1, 10, and 19, *Petrusha* discloses executing a command from an application program (registry editor) to store at least one variable maintained by the operating system in a data object accessible to the application program, wherein the application program is executing on the operating system; executing an operating system command in response to the command from the application program to retrieve the requested at least one variable; and storing the retrieved at least one variable in the data object (the registry editor interacts with the operating system's registry to retrieve registry entry data through the WIN32 Registry API; see, for example, the last paragraph on page 35; the section titled "Browsing the Registry with RegEdit" on pages 38-41; and the section titled "The Registry Editor and the Registry" on pages 61-68).

As per claims 2, 11, and 20, *Petrusha* further discloses receiving a request from the application program for at least one variable maintained by the operating system (the user may attempt to expand a key within the GUI environment of the registry editor); and determining whether the requested variable is in the data object, wherein the command from the application program is processed to retrieve and store the at least one variable in the data object if the requested at least one variable is not in the data object (if the selected key's subkey information has not yet been gathered by the program, the subkeys are retrieved, enumerated and added as nodes in the TreeView control; see the first paragraph on page 68).

As per claims 3, 12, and 21, *Petrusha* further discloses receiving a request from a second application program for at least one variable maintained by the operating system (MICROSOFT Remote Registry Services Client); and returning the requested at least one variable from the data object populated as a result of the command executed by the first application program (MICROSOFT Remote Registry Services Server; the Server program interacts with the remote computer's registry via the WIN32 Registry API on behalf of the Client program, and registry entries obtained by the Server program are transmitted to the Client and displayed within the Client-side Registry Editor interface; see, for example, the section titled "Accessing the Registry on Remote Computers" on pages 60-61).

As per claims 4, 13, and 22, *Petrusha* further discloses the requested at least one variable retrieved as a result of execution of the command from the application program being a set of environment variables (registry entries are environment variables).

As per claims 6, 15, and 24, *Petrusha* further discloses the command from the application program and the operating system command being executed in a first process and the application

program being executed in a second process (the registry editor application and the WIN32 Registry API are inherently separate processes).

6. Claims, 1, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17, 19, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Steve DeGroof, "Class IniFile," December 1998 (hereinafter *DeGroof*).

As per claims 1, 10, and 19, *DeGroof* discloses executing a command from an application program (a JAVA programming language program containing calls to the methods of the IniFile class) to store at least one variable maintained by the operating system in a data object accessible to the application program, wherein the application program is executing on the operating system; executing an operating system command in response to the command from the application program to retrieve the requested at least one variable; and storing the retrieved at least one variable in the data object (the IniFile class contains methods to read and parse data from WINDOWS operating system .ini files into *subjects*, *variables*, and *values* data structures accessible by the application; see the descriptions in the variable index of page 1 and the method index entry for parseLines() on page 2).

As per claims 7, 16, and 25, *DeGroof* further discloses the command from the application program being for storing multiple variables (multiple variables can exist in an .ini file); retrieving the requested variables comprising generating a data stream including the variables, comprising reading the variables from the data stream into a buffer (a vector of lines); and processing each line in the buffer to determine each variable name and value, wherein each determined variable name and value is stored in the data object (the parseLines() method parses

the lines and populates the subjects, variables and values vectors with the resulting data; see the description of parseLines() on page 2).

As per claims 8, 17, and 26, *DeGroof* further discloses determining each variable name and value comprising: determining a location of an equal sign; setting the variable name to the string preceding the equal sign; and setting the variable value to the string following the equal sign (this is inherently performed; as is illustrated on page 1, "variable=value", where "variable" and "value" are both strings, is part of the standard file format for an .ini file; by parsing the lines of the file and populating the variable and value data structures, the equal sign is inherently being recognized by the parser).

7. Claims 1, 5, 10, 14, 19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jonathan Locke, "Parlex-vous J/Direct?," June 1998 (hereinafter *Locke*).

As per claims 1, 10, and 19, *Locke* discloses executing a command from an application program (a JAVA programming language program employing J/DIRECT programming code) to store at least one variable maintained by the operating system in a data object accessible to the application program, wherein the application program is executing on the operating system; executing an operating system command in response to the command from the application program to retrieve the requested at least one variable; and storing the retrieved at least one variable in the data object (the GetEnvironmentVariable function contained in KERNEL32.DLL is called from the J/DIRECT programming code via the getEnv method in order to retrieve a environment variable value from the operating system; the value is returned in a string buffer

accessible by the application program; see the question and answer beginning in the last line of page 1 and continuing onto page 2).

As per claims 5, 14, and 23, *Locke* further discloses determining a type of the operating system (WINDOWS NT or WINDOWS 95 operating systems); and selecting the operating system command from a set of native operating system commands for different types of operating systems, wherein the selected operating system command is capable of being executed on the operating system to retrieve the requested at least one variable, and wherein the application program is capable of executing on each of the different types of operating systems (a translation function determines whether the stringbuffer format is Unicode (WINDOWS NT operating system) or ANSI (WINDOWS 95 operating system), in which case the output is translated to Unicode; see the paragraph near the middle of the page beginning "It is interesting to note...").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 9, 18, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steve DeGroof, "Class IniFile," December 1998 (hereinafter *DeGroof*).

As per claims 9, 18, and 27, *DeGroof* discloses the variable name and value for each variable being maintained on at least one line, further comprising: processing each line in the data stream on a line-by-line basis; determining whether each line includes the equal sign, wherein, for each line including the equal sign, the variable name being set to the string preceding the equal sign and the variable value being set to the string following the equal sign (see the disclosure applied above to claim 8). *DeGroof* fails to expressly disclose appending the content of each line not including the equal sign to the variable value. However, Official Notice is taken that it has been known to employ line wrapping in text files when a line exceeds a predetermined length. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of *DeGroof* to append the contents of a line onto a parsed value from a previous line to compensate for line wrapping that may have occurred. One would be motivated to do so to ensure that elements are parsed in their entirety.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric B. Kiss whose telephone number is (703) 305-7737. The

examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri., 7:30 am - 5:00 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria,VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 22202, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

EBK
July 11, 2003

TUAN Q. DAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER